

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment.

On February 13, 2008 applicants' representative, Daniel P. Morris had a telephonic interview with Examiner Dudek. Examiner Dudek acknowledged that claims 14, 64, 65, 73, 94, 103 and 121 were allowed in Office Action dated 09/07/2005. Examiner Dudek indicated that if applicants cancelled all pending claims except for claims 14, 64, 65, 73, 94, 103 and 121, this would place this application in condition for allowance. Applicants have followed the Examiner's suggestion and this application should be in condition for allowance.

Each claim 14, 64, 65, 73, 94, 103 and 121 is an independent claim. Applicants believe that each of these claims are directed to a patentably distinct invention or a patentably distinct species with no generic claim to these species. Applicants suggest the following restriction requirement.

Group	Claims in the Group
1	14
2	64
3	65
4	73
5	94
6	103
7	104

If the Examiner agrees with applicants' Suggested Restriction Requirement, applicants elect without traverse Group 1, applicants authorize the Examiner to cancel claims 64, 65, 73, 94, 103 and 104 by Examiner's amendment, request that the Examiner state in the Examiner's amendment agreement with the Suggested Restriction Requirement and issue a Notice of Allowance for claim 14.

If the Examiner does not agree with the Suggested Restriction Requirement, applicants' respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for claims 14, 64, 65, 73, 94, 103 and 104.

In view of the changes to the claims and the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by applicants, applicants file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner, ... the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

Respectfully submitted,

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

By: /Daniel P. Morris/
Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.
Reg. No. 32,053
Phone No. (914) 945-3217